

# OF MESTIZA CONSCIOUSNESS AND CULTURAL SCHIZOPHRENIA: INGLOURIOUS BASTARD OF TURKISH LITERATURE IN *GÖLGELER VE HAYALLER ŞEHRİNDE*

MELEZ BİLİNCE VE KÜLTÜREL ŞİZOFRENİYE DAİR: *GÖLGELER VE HAYALLER ŞEHRİNDE* TÜRK EDEBİYATININ SOYSUZU



## Mehmet Mustafa ÖRÜCÜ

Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding  
Author:

Araştırma Görevlisi, Sakarya  
Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi,  
Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü,  
Sakarya, Türkiye.

ORCID: 0000-0001-7851-5790

E-mail: orucu@sakarya.edu.tr

Geliş Tarihi/Submitted: 12.03.2022

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 14.05.2022

Kaynak Gösterim / Citation:

Örücü, Mehmet Mustafa. "Of  
Mestiza Consciousness and Cultural  
Schizophrenia: Inglourious Bastard  
of Turkish Literature in *Gölgeler  
ve Hayaller Şehrinde*", *Yeni Türk  
Edebiyatı Araştırmaları*. 14/27,  
001-014.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.26517/ytea.510>

## Abstract

This article analyzes Murat Gülsoy's approach to intellectual as one of the most controversial topics in Turkish literature in his novel titled *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*, comparatively with *Inglourious Basterds* by Quentin Tarantino. Tarantino's portrayal of the holocaust with different fiction is the only starting point of this analysis. Throughout this novel, Gülsoy questions the criticisms on Turkish intellectual, who has been an image of the other in Turkish literature, building a gateway between the mestiza consciousness of intellectual and our consciousness. The fact that the main character of the novel, Fuat, opens his heart to the reader transparently and sincerely, almost transforming his mestiza consciousness into a mirror in which the reader can watch himself/herself. The author can capture this sincerity and transparency thanks to the epistolary novel. This article claims that Murat Gülsoy objects to the intellectual chosen as the scapegoat for our modernization story in Turkish literature.

**Keywords:** *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*, intellectual, mestiza consciousness, cultural schizophrenia.

## Öz

Bu makale, Murat Gülsoy'un *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* adlı romanında, Türk edebiyatının en tartışmalı konularından biri olan aydın meselesini farklı bir bakış açısı ile ele almasını, Quentin Tarantino'nun *Inglourious Basterds* filmi ile mukayeseli bir biçimde analiz etmeye çalışır. Tarantino'nun, nazi soykırımını farklı bir kurgu ile vermesi ve Yahudileri tatmin amaçlı üretilen filmlere eleştirel yaklaşımı analizini yalnızca çıkış noktasını oluşturmaktadır. Makalede Gülsoy'un bu romanı ile Türk edebiyatında bir nevi öteki imgesine dönüştürülen aydının mestiza bilinci ile kendi bilincimiz arasında köprü kurarak Türk aydınına yöneltilen eleştirileri sorguladığı iddia edilmektedir. İki yüz yıldır yaşanan kültürel şizofreni hikâyesinin sadece aydına mal edilemeyeceğini imleyerek bir aydının hikâyesi üzerinden kendi gerçekliğimizi fark etmemizi sağlamaya çalışır. Romanın ana karakteri Fuat'ın mektup anlatım tekniği sayesinde içini şeffaf ve samimi bir biçimde okuyucuya açması, yaralı bilincini, içinde kendimizi seyrettiğimiz bir aynaya adeta dönüştürmektedir. Gülsoy bu romanı ile, Türk aydınının, edebi metinlerde modernleşme hikâyemizin günah keçisine dönüştürülmesine itiraz etmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*, aydın, melez bilinç, kültürel şizofreni.

## Extended Summary

Türk modernleşme sürecinde aydının kuşkusuz önemli bir yeri vardır. Modern Türk edebiyatında kurucu bir özne olarak aydın imgesi, zamanla modernleşmenin getirdiği bazı sancılı durumların neticesinde sanki kimliksiz, köksüz, melez olan, geleneksel değerlerden kopamayan ama modern değerlere de tutunamayan yalnızca oymuş gibi eleştirilmiş ve gitgide edebiyatta edilgen bir nesneye dönüştürülmüştür. Murat Gülsoy, modernleşme sürecimizin başlamasından yaklaşık iki yüzyıl sonra, önemli bir kırılma noktası olan İkinci Meşrutiyet yıllarına giderek aydının "şeyleşen" melez bilincini farklı bir bakış açısı ile *Gölgele ve Hayaller Şehrinde* romanında ele alır. Bu makalede Gülsoy'un aydın sorununa ve dolayısıyla çarpık Türk modernleşmesine farklı yaklaşımı Quentin Tarantino'nun *Inglourious Basterds* filminde Nazi ve soykırım meselelerine yaklaşımı üzerinden ele alınmıştır.

İkinci Dünya Savaşı yıllarını ele alan filmlerde, bilindiği üzere Naziler avcı, Yahudiler ise kurban olarak tasvir edilir. Bu konunun yoğun biçimde işlendiği filmlere "Yahudiler için porno" adı verilmektedir. Yahudi sermayesinin soykırım konusunu sinema endüstrisinde canlı tutmak için ciddi paralar harcadığı bilinmektedir. Kurban imajını devamlı canlı tutmak, İsrail devletinin terörist eylemlerini perdelemek için işlevsel olabilir. Tarantino'nun bu filmi hakkında yapılan yorumlar her ne kadar genellikle filmlerinde kullandığı intikam izleği üzerine yoğunlaşsa da *Inglourious Basterds* filmi bize bundan çok daha fazlasını verir. Bunlardan biri de Yahudilerin soykırım meselesi üzerinden sinemayı tahakküm altına alması ve kurban imgesi arkasına sığınarak kendi davranış ve eylemlerini perdelemesine duyulan tepkidir. Murat Gülsoy ve Tarantino'nun farklı konulara benzer bir tutumla itiraz ettiğini söyleyebiliriz. Dolayısıyla Tarantino'nun filmi ile yapılan karşılaştırma, Gülsoy'un Türk edebiyatında âdeta günah keçisine dönüştürülen aydın imgesi hakkındaki itirazını daha iyi anlayabilmek için çalışmamızda yalnızca bir çıkış noktası olarak değerlendirilmelidir.

Tarantino, filminde alışıldık avcı-kurban denklemini ters yüz eder. Filmde Yahudiler avcı, Naziler ise kurban konumundadır. Bu bağlamda filmde dikkat çekici bir sahne vardır. Bu sahnede sahibi gizli bir Yahudi

olan sinema salonunda Nazi propagandası yapan bir filmin galası sergilenir. Galada Nazilerin üst düzey komuta kademesi bulunur. Sinema salonuna yapılan bir baskın neticesinde orada bulunan Nazilerin tamamı dakikalarca yayım ateşine tutulmak suretiyle öldürülür ve akabinde salon havaya uçurulur. Bu sahne Tarantino'nun soykırım konusunu ele alan filmlere biçtiği bir son olarak yorumlanabilir. Böylece seyircinin soykırım meselesinin işlendiği filmlere ve sinema üzerindeki hâkimiyetine farklı bir gözle bakmasını sağlar. Gülsoy'un romanında ise birtakım tarihsel gerçeklere dayanan bir hikâye ile karşılaşırız. Romanın ana karakteri Fuat, Türk edebiyatının en tartışmalı isimlerinden Beşir Fuad'ın Fransız metresinden dünyaya gelen oğludur. İstanbul'da doğan Fuat, çocukluk yıllarında İstanbul'da meydana gelen bazı hadiselerden dolayı annesiyle beraber Paris'e gitmek zorunda kalır. Annesi, Fuat orada sorun yaşamamasın diye ona Franc ismini verir. Böylece Fuat'ın çift isimli, çift dilli, çift kültürlü hayatı başlamış olur.

İkinci Meşrutiyet'in ilanından sonra doğduğu topraklara Fuat genç bir gazeteci olarak geri döner. Bu yolculuk, Fuat'ın melez kimliği ile hesaplaşması neticesinde ne Doğulu kimliği ile ne de Batılı kimliği ile kendini tanımlayabildiği derin bir yalnızlık içinde son bulur. Paris'te iken Doğulu olduğu için az gelişmiş ve barbar olarak dışlanan Fuat, İstanbul'a geldiğinde geleneksel değerlerine yabancılaşmış, soysuz, köksüz bir yabancı olarak telakki edilir. Daryush Shayegan, Batı ile yüzleşen Müslüman toplumlarda bu durumun kültürel şizofreniye yol açtığını, çünkü modernitenin nazarında az gelişmiş, geleneksel toplum nazarında ise yabancı bir benliğe sahip olduğumuzu dile getirir. Fuat'ın melez bilincinde iki epistemenin hesaplaşmasına tanıklık ederiz. Uyku ile uyanıklık arasında gördüğü sanrılarda aynı anda hem Fatih Sultan Mehmet'in İstanbul'u fethederken duyduğu gururu, hem de Hristiyan cemaatinin yaşadığı korku ve dehşeti yaşar. İki epistemenin savaşı Fuat'ın sanrılarında kendini bu şekilde belli eder. Hesaplaşma şiddetlendikçe Fuat edilgen olur, hem Doğulu kimliğine hem Batılı kimliğine yabancılaşarak şizofren bir ruh haline bürünür. Kültürel şizofreni sağlıklı düşünme ve eylem yeteneklerini esir alarak onu tam bir yalnızlık içinde realiteden soyutlar.

Roman boyunca bugüne değin Türk aydını hakkında ileri sürülen köksüz, soysuz, babasız, yabancı, kimliksiz, başkalaşmış, iki arada kalmış, melez ve benzeri bütün suçlamaları Fuat bizzat kendine yöneltir. Hatta daha da ileri giderek kendini Notre Dame'nin Kamburu olarak görür. Hem Doğu toplumunun hem de Batı toplumunun kendisi hakkındaki algı, düşünce ve bakış açılarını tam bir teslimiyet ile kabul eder ve acımasızca kendini eleştirir. Kendine yönelttiği eleştiriler, bu eleştiriler açıkça diyebiliriz ki bugüne değin Türk aydınına yöneltilen eleştirilerin toplamıdır, doğrultusunda içinde bulunduğu durumdan çıkış için çareler arar. Ne var ki bu çarelerin hiçbiri şizofreniye sürüklenişini durduramaz.

Bu roman ilk bakışta Türk aydınına eleştiren başka bir roman olarak değerlendirilebilir. Ancak, Gülsoy, kullandığı mektup roman tekniği sayesinde bu yargının roman boyunca kademe kademe değişmesini sağlamıştır. Mektup roman anlatım tekniğinin en önemli özelliklerinden biri yazarın, karakter ile okuyucu arasından çekilmesi ve okuyucunun doğrudan hadise, duygu ve düşüncelere temas etmesini sağlamaktır. Bütün roman Fuat'ın arkadaşı Alex'e gönderdiği mektuplardan oluşur. Bu anlatım tekniği sayesinde Fuat'ın en mahrem duygu ve düşüncelerini arada herhangi bir anlatıcı olmadan izleme fırsatı yakalarız. Böylece roman ilerledikçe okuyucu olarak romanın bir karakterine, belki de Alex'e hatta Fuat'ın bizatihi kendisine dönüşürüz. Bu sayede okuyucu ile Fuat arasında bir duygudaşlık oluşur ve Fuat'ın yaşadığı trajedinin aslında kendi trajedisi olduğunu okuyucu fark eder. Bu bakımdan Fuat'ın yaralı bilinci, içinde kendi melez kimliğimizi gördüğümüz bir aynaya dönüşür. Yazar bu suretle Türk aydınına yıllardır yapılan bir haksızlığın altını çizer. Ona atfedilen melez bilincin ve kültürel şizofreninin dışında kendimizi tutamayacağımızı, modernleşmenin getirdiği çarpıklıkları sadece Türk aydınına yükleyerek toplumun her tabakasında tecrübe edilen melez kimlikten kaynaklanan çelişkileri görmezden gelemeyeceğimizi imler.

## Introduction

When you watch the trailer of the 2009 movie *Inglourious Basterds*, directed by Quentin Tarantino and starring well-known actors like Brad Pitt, you might think of dealing with another Jewish holocaust movie that has been called "porn for Jews" in the industry of cinema. It is alleged that these films can be regarded as a genre since the holocaust is handled so much in the movie industry. This genre is called porn for Jews. Steven Speilberg's *Münih*, Otto Preminger's *Exodus* movies are reciting among the best representations of this genre. Films dealing with the holocaust are very common in the movie industry. It is even known that the Jewish capital invests lots of money in such films. These movies are common enough to be called a genre. Most of these films were shot to satisfy Jews. This genre is called "porn for Jews" in the movie industry because of this reason. Keeping the holocaust invariably alive in the cinema creates an area of victimization for Jews and legitimizes their unjust actions. The primary fiction of these films depends on the fact that Jews are victims and Nazis are the hunter. Thus an image that constantly shows Jews in a victim position takes place in people's minds.

However, when you watch Tarantino's movie in full, it does not take long to figure out that the fact is not coinciding with your prejudice. Tarantino, on the contrary, parodied these kinds of films. He brackets concepts such as the holocaust, Nazi, cinema, and propaganda to make it possible to reconsider them. Tarantino, in this regard, expresses his dissatisfaction with the fact that the theme of genocide has taken over the cinema so much by reversing the usual discourse that Nazis are hunters and Jews are victims.

You might want to take a gun to punish those who committed genocide of European Jews by shooting them as and when watching such kinds of movies! It might be said that the producers of those films, at least, expect the audience to feel that way. Tarantino satisfied producers in his film with a different fiction that has parodical references. Common fiction - as mentioned above - was dependent on the discourse that Nazis are hunters, and Jews are victims. He reversed it as though

Jews were hunters, and Nazis were victims. However, it becomes clear that his aim was not to satisfy Jews as and when he combined his absurd Nazi killing fantasies with the post-modern techniques. The director's ultimate purpose becomes clear in the scene carried symbolic meanings in which the theme of genocide is finally brought together with the propagandist cinema that could be considered as another theme of the film.

In this scene, there is the premiere of a film that makes the propaganda of Nazis in a cinema hall that belongs to a Jew who conceals her identity, in Paris. All the high-ranking officers of Nazis are there. There is an arranged attack on the hall, and all of the high-ranking officers get killed by the firing squad. Tarantino brings Jewish satisfaction to its peak in this scene, then it is blown up. The fact that the movie theater belongs to a secret Jew, a propaganda film is played in the theater, and after a fusillade of automatic fire for minutes on Nazis, and as if that wasn't enough, the movie theater was blown up with everyone inside, was Tarantino's fictitious end to the movie industry that propagandizes the Holocaust, and to the domination of Jews on it. The director, thereby, tries to change the point of view of audiences by reversing a usual theme.

The issue of intellectual, on the other hand, is one of the most common topics in Turkish literature. As a discussed, manipulated, instrumentalized, otherized figure, the intellectual is riddled by not surgeon's tenderness but by the hangman's insensitivity and finally turned into a bundle in which all weaknesses and inconsistencies of the society are emptied. Accordingly, the intellectual finds a place for himself in Turkish literature, in a position that has completely lost his competence and is always defined from someone else's perspective and hence objectified.

Although the Turkish intellectual is one of the actors of our modernization story, he has been considered as a scapegoat as time goes up, so the process of modernization brought some difficult pains and contradictions. To justify our weaknesses and contradictions stem from the cultural schizophrenia based on modernization Turkish intellectual has been targeted. In other words, we can be able to

obscure them just as the Israeli state legitimizes its terrorist acts by keeping the Holocaust alive in the movie industry.

## Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde As a Mirror of Cultural Schizophrenia

Murat Gülsoy, in his novel, *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*, evaluates the image of Turkish intellectual, which has been used in Turkish literature since the Tanzimat Reform Era with an approach similar to Tarantino's in this film. These concepts such as "rootlessness", "fatherlessness", "unhappiness", "epistemological break", "suicide", "search for a father", "east-west issue", "mixing of two cultures", "monstrous" used to describe Turkish intellectual, turn into cruel concepts that Fuat, the main character of the novel, uses to define himself. In a sense, Fuat turns into a target for any Turkish reader who suffers from modernization to satisfy themselves as Tarantino does for Jews in his film. However, there is a difference that stands out, has been brought forward by this article. It is evaluated that the author has consciously put forward this difference in the following lines.

Before making this evaluation, it is necessary to talk about some historical realities on which the fictional structure of the novel is based. The novel is about the story of Fuat, whose father was Beşir Fuat, the first positivist and naturalist in Turkish literature. Beşir Fuat is a name with symbolic value in Turkish modernization due to his positivist and rationalist thoughts and his tragic suicide. According to Orhan Okay (31), The Jesuit School had an undeniable impact on his views, as well as on the spiritual crisis that drove him to suicide.

Moreover, Fuat has the same name as his father. He was born to his father's French mistress in Istanbul. His mother had to go to France, taking him by herself due to some social upheavals that followed years. There, she gives Fuat the name Franc, and this is how Fuat's double-name, bilingual, dual-identity life begins. While traveling between those names he also feels with his whole being the tension created by the cultural change he experienced with the name as well.

Thus, a perception of life and identity began, in which two different epistemes present themselves at the same time. Okay (358), called this situation as mülemma (macaronic). Mülemma is a kind of poem, each verse of which is written in a different language. The other meaning of mülemma is to be multicolored. Therefore, he claims that our confrontation with the West should not be interpreted as a synthesis as both civilizations still continue to preserve their values (Okay 358). The mülemma situation has manifested itself in every aspect of our socio-cultural, economic, and political life, accompanied by various pains since two centuries. It can be mentioned about a traumatic tension caused by the recounter of two different epistemes in our subconsciousness. Moreover, it can be mentioned about a traumatic tension caused by the recounter of two different epistemes in our society's collective subconsciousness. Michael Foucault (50-51), claims that two figures are trying to capture each other in this duel.

The situation of our society since the Tanzimat coincides with what Foucault (50-51), refers to as twinning. We are faced with a subconsciousness that has turned into a conflict ground of two epistemes that are constantly trying to cover and seize each other for nearly two hundred years. Although there is a state of "metamorphose" throughout all classes of society, it was the Turkish intellectual who felt the pain of this the most. Despite this, Turkish intellectual has often been the target of critics. The Turkish intellectual has been considered as an object in Turkish literature as a result. This situation has led to the continuous strengthening of the belief that Turkish intellectual is rootless, degenerate, and inglorious.

Moreover, this conviction gives us relief by legitimizing our distortions resulting from cultural schizophrenia. Thus, instead of examining our degeneracy, rootlessness, and mestiza consciousness to redefine ourselves, we clean ourselves up by declaring the Turkish intellectual as a scapegoat. It is possible to see this attitude in novels, poems, or critical essays throughout our modernization process. Similar to the attitude of Jews distracting from attention on their actions by hiding behind the facts of genocide, Turkish intellectual's mestiza consciousness is transformed into a ground where conflicts,

contradictions, confusion, and distortions created by our problematic connection with modernity are justified.

Murat Gülsoy's novel, at first glance, may seem like pornography written for those who exhibit the attitude that has been mentioned above. Because, in Fuat's consciousness, he revealed every claim about the identity of the Turkish intellectual in the most transparent way. However, it is as if Fuat's reproach in the letter he wrote to his friend Alex was addressed to the reader, not to his friend." I... I am a vagrant who has no home, no family, no land, and no country. Who wants someone that doesn't belong anywhere, Alex?" (Gülsoy 206). Elsewhere, Fuat goes so far as to compare himself to the Quasimodo of Notre Dame.

When I couldn't understand what Victor was saying, I used to think it was because I wasn't fully French. This is my barbaric side, I was telling myself. At such times, Victor would become a giant with a whip in his hand, the priest of Notre Dame in my eyes, and I, of course, was becoming Quasimodo. I wasn't physically ugly and disgusting, but still, the disgust on the faces of the children who learned that I was half Turkish made me feel as if I am Semimodo, if not the Quasimodo (Gülsoy 201).

It is rare to encounter more incisive expressions than these said about intellectual in Turkish literature by now. On the other hand, these accusations that Fuat makes for himself lead the readers to empathize with his tragic story. It is not only his French stepfather but also in his society that Fuat perceived like this. Society, to cover up its amorphousness, ruthlessly criticized, and ostracized intellectual as if he is the only amorphous one. His friend Evelyn puts into words what Fuat means to Muslims: "you may not be pleased to hear this, Fuat, but I think you have no difference from Marcel in the eyes of those men" (Gülsoy 148). Fuat does not belong to both societies, either to the West or the East: "I am tired of not belonging here. Still can't go...because I do not belong in Paris either. Charles, Marcel, Evelyn, Margeret, all of them, can go any places they like with the confidence of belonging somewhere" (Gülsoy 291). The West sees Fuat as an easterner, barbarian, and underdeveloped, on the other hand, the East sees Fuat as rootless, and inglorious, therefore both

civilizations don't accept him. "In Islamic societies confronting the West, the ego is still underdeveloped and alienated in the eyes of both modernity and tradition" (Shayegan 64). Throughout the following lines, we can observe how both epistemes try to capture each other, and the consciousness of Fuat is a battle area of these epistemes.

But Alex, then, very different things happened in my mind. I felt how Mehmet Fatih was filled with enthusiasm when he rubbed his bloody hand to columns as well as the fear and horror of the Christian community... as if I was both this and the other. I was both the murderer and the victim...I was in the body of both, they were both in my body as well (Gülsoy 91-92).

The whole novel progresses as Fuat reckons with himself and seeks a cure for his rootlessness. He tries to build his identity and get a new grip on his presence in Istanbul, tracing his father in the middle of an epistemic battle. Thus, both political and literary discourse reflects the lack of a father during the first stages of Ottoman westernization (Parla 15). Although Fuat is tracing his father for a while, he questions the image of father due to his doubts about whether finding his father will tie him to a root and a past. By this way, he start to see his past as a ruin

Where could I reach him, tracing him all the time? What intrigued me about my father? Was I expecting to figure out something about myself? Was I expecting to see the lines on their faces that belonged to my father and naturally to myself when I found my brothers? As if these lines would have connected me to this country? Was it a connection that I was looking forward to? Didn't being rootless mean freedom for me until that day? The house was there. My past was a ruin (Gülsoy 190).

Hence, Fuat's first meeting with his brothers did not occur as he had imagined. He is not welcomed by his brothers. Not only did they reject him as a brother, but also blamed his mistress mother for their father's death. This confrontation with his brothers brings a destructive consequence for Fuat. The hope of holding on to the past through the image of father is at the stage of exhaustion. His is now one step closer to his schizophrenic fate.

On the other hand, we figure out that it is our story that emerges, word by word, into Fuat's consciousness when the story ends up. This aspect of the novel distinguishes it from others written about this subject. The Turkish intellectual and his mestiza consciousness, as it happens to everyone in the process of an epistemological break, drift towards cultural schizophrenia. Gülsoy shows the intellectual in this novel as the most naked representation of our consciousness. He implies that no one of our society can separate himself from cultural schizophrenia.

Such a person, says R.D. Laing (15), cannot experience himself "at home" or "with others" in this world, but rather experiences himself in hopeless solitude and isolation. Fuat's story, which begins with a journey, ends in complete loneliness and isolation as a result of not feeling that he belongs anywhere or anyone. Therefore it can be asserted that Fuat's attempt to connect himself with a place throughout tracing his father and brothers has resulted in disappointment. When he finds out that his father, Beşir Fuat, was an intellectual who is an advocate of western values, a glimmer of hope appears in him. Although this fact allowed him to combine his eastern identity with the western identity it was not enough to get rid of cultural schizophrenia. The fact that his father committed suicide extinguished his last crumbs of hope.

Cultural schizophrenia turns into a historical destiny or a genetic inheritance in Gülsoy's novel. It is possible to find traces of amorphousness of society stemming from modernization in the detail of this genetic inheritance. Additionally, the fact that the author hastily and carelessly wrote anything about Fuat disturbs the reader, thus, leading a bond between Fuat and the reader. Consequently, we swing between Fuat's consciousness and our consciousness, his rootlessness and our rootlessness, his straddle of two cultures and ours. Due to his story being ours by now, the empathy between Fuat and us cannot be considered astonishing. Hereafter, every needle stuck in the mestiza consciousness of the Turkish intellectual, transformed into the voodoo doll of Turkish literature, begins to injure the reader's consciousness.

## Of Mestiza Consciousness and Cultural Schizophrenia: Inglorious Bastard Of Turkish Literature in *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*

The main character of any story, says Gülsoy (206), is mostly altered at the end of his journey. This conclusion is convenient for the main character of this novel as well. The novel starts with the journey of Fuat towards Istanbul, after the declaration of The Second Constitutional Era. Because it leads to an epistemological rupture, The Second Constitutional Monarchy is at a significant level in our history (Meriç 265). So the time of the journey is not coincidental. Fuat is not the only one who comes out of this journey by changing, the reader also changes and faces his prejudices about the Turkish intellectual. Because of this feature of *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*, it is possible to say that the novel is an example of modern allegory in Turkish literature. Many of the novels in Turkish literature are a national allegory, says Parla (13), thereby, are built on a story in which the problems of the nation are represented via the main character.

Nevertheless, the samples of the novels pointed as national allegory have some characteristics regarding as obstacles between the main character and reader, thus, the reader was not able to see himself as the part of the story. However, in this novel, Gülsoy removes the obstacles between the reader and the intellectual's consciousness which was objectified until now. Because the mestiza consciousness of intellectual has been discussed once and again, it no longer meant anything more than a practical object for the artist, critic, and reader. Gülsoy objects to this apathy in his novel. It can be asserted that *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* is consequently an attempt to save Turkish intellectual from being objectified. The author utilizes some writing techniques to achieve his goal. The pre-eminent one is choosing the type of epistolary novel. For those who want to reach meaning from matter, says Kefeli (32), the epistolary novel because of its nounless form could be an interesting type. Moreover, she says, epistolary fiction is a useful instrument for the author to convey his feelings and thoughts. She finally claims that it allows gazing at the dark sides of the human psyche. "It positions us not just as spectators, but also as detectives, sleuths, and scopophiles who gaze through the keyhole and watch as the action unfolds" (O'Dwyer 180). Thus, the epistolary

novel re-creates a private realm for the reader to observe other lives (Aşçı 9; Nelson 1).

## Conclusion

Like in many epistolary writings, the reader becomes a character in *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* as well. To become a character of the novel, hence, allows establishing a bond between the reader and the objectified consciousness of intellectual. This process is a kind of empathy in which the reader confronts his prejudices about Turkish intellectual while Fuat faces the facts about his mestiza identity during the story. Therefore, the reader realizes that the consciousness of Fuat is indeed a mirror showing the reader's own mestiza identity.

Eventually, in his novel, Murat Gülsoy constructs a mestiza consciousness depending on the critics socially enforced to the intellectual, as a mirror capable of reflecting collective subconsciousness via epistolary narration. It is therefore possible for him to alter the perspective of society. The author, on the other hand, gives the views put forward up to this time on the causes of cultural schizophrenia experienced by the Turkish intellectual and the prescriptions for getting rid of schizophrenia on a fictional basis. But none of them could prevent Fuat from getting lost in a deep loneliness and isolation. Additionally, he implies that these solutions are useless and addresses that the problems caused by modernization should be considered from a different point of view as our modernization story is not flat but round.

## Kaynakça

Aşcı, Yasemin. "Letter Tradition and Epistolary Novel in American Literature", *The Journal of International Social Research*, c. 13, s. 74, 2020, ss. 5-12.

Foucault, Michel. *Kelimeler ve Şeyler*. Çeviren Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, 2017.

Gülsoy, Murat. *Gölgele ve Hayaller Şehrinde*. Can Yayınları, 2014.

Gülsoy, Murat. *Büyübozumu: YaratıcıYazarlık*. Can Yayınları, 2016.

Kefeli, Emel. *Anlatım Tekniği Olarak Mektup*. Kitabevi, 2007.

Laing, R.D. *Bölünmüş Benlik*. Çeviren Ergün Akça, Pinhan Yayınları, 2012.

Meriç, Cemil. *Kültürden İrfana*. İletişim Yayınları, 2013.

O'Dwyer, Erin. "Of Letters, Love, and Lack: A Lacanian Analysis of Ian McEwan's Epistolary Novel Atonement", *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, vl. 57, issue 2, 2016, pp. 178-190.

Okay, Orhan. *Beşir Fuat- İlk Türk Pozitivist ve Natüralisti*. Dergâh Yayınları, 2008.

Okay, Orhan. *Batı Medeniyeti Karşısında Ahmet Mithat Efendi*. Dergâh Yayınları, 2017.

Parla, Jale. *Babalar ve Oğullar Tanzimat Romanının Epistemolojik Temelleri*. İletişim Yayınları, 2006.

Parla, Jale. *Türk Romanında Yazar ve Başkalaşım*. İletişim Yayınları, 2015.

Shayegan, Daryush. *Cultural Schizophrenia: Islamic Societies Confronting the West*. Syracuse University Press, 1997.